UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,392	06/22/2001	John R. Hampton	41394-00009USPT	7158

7590 06/30/2003

Margaret A. Boulware
Jenkens & Gilchrist
A Professional Corporation
1100 Louisiana, Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77002-5214

EXAMINER
POPOVICS, ROBERT J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1724	4

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/887,392	Hampton et al.
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Popovics	1724

—Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath th correspondence address—

P riod for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 30 Days ~~MONTH(S)~~ FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/8/02.

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition f Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claim(s) 1-48 are subject to restriction or election requirement

Applicati n Papers

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity und r 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachm nt(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO–1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO–413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO–892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO–152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Pat nt Drawing Review, PTO–948

☐ Oth r _____

Office Action Summary

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-44, drawn to FILTRATION APPARATUS, classified in class 210, subclass **247**.

II. Claims 45-48, drawn to a METHOD OF FILTERING FLUIDS, classified in class 210, subclass **767**.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions of Group II and Group I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, since the method claims do not recite all of the limitations recited in the apparatus claims, such as, a core member, perforations through a portion of the sleeve, and the specific materials of construction.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species	*Corresponding Drawing Figure*
1	1
2	4
3	5

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement **must include** an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, **and a listing of all claims readable thereon**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission

may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Specification

7. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever it appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from Examiner Popovics whose telephone number is (703) 308-0684.

rjp
June 28, 2003

ROBERT POPOVICS
PRIMARY EXAMINER